

IN THE CLAIMS

1. – 9. *Previously cancelled.*
10. *original.* A cosmetic composition comprising an amphoteric urethane resin having at least one carboxyl group and at least one tertiary amino group in one molecule, and a water-soluble resin.
11. *original.* The cosmetic composition of claim 10, wherein the water-soluble resin is a nonionic resin.
12. *original.* The cosmetic composition of claim 10, wherein the water-soluble resin is an anionic resin.
13. *original.* The cosmetic composition of claim 10, wherein the water-soluble resin is a cationic resin.
14. *original.* The cosmetic composition of claim 10, wherein the water-soluble resin is an amphoteric resin.
15. *original.* The cosmetic composition of claim 10, wherein the amphoteric urethane resin has in its structure a structural unit that is derived from ethylene oxide.
16. *original.* The cosmetic composition of claim 10, wherein the amphoteric urethane resin has in its structure at least one polysiloxane bond.
17. *original.* The cosmetic composition of claim 10, wherein the amphoteric resin is an aqueous liquid.
18. *original.* The cosmetic composition of claim 15, wherein the amphoteric resin is an aqueous liquid.
19. *original.* The cosmetic composition of claim 16, wherein the amphoteric resin is an aqueous liquid.
20. *original.* The cosmetic composition of claim 10, wherein such composition is selected from the group consisting of a hair cosmetic, a skin care cosmetic and a make-up cosmetic.

**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 10-20 were pending.

Claims 10, 15-16 and 19-20 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 14 and 24-27 of copending S.N. 10/049,361.

Claims 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite.

Claims 10, 14-15, 17-18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatt, et al. (2002/0071811) in view of Kim, et al. (US 6,335,003).

Claims 11-13, 16 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatt, et al. (2002/0071811) in view of Kim, et al. (US 6,335,003) and further in view of de la Poterie, et al. (US 5,972,354) in further view of Bolich, et al. (US 5,100,658).

Claims 10-20 are presented for reconsideration.